



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/347,753	07/06/1999	CHRISTIAN R. LEHEW	1880	4263

7590 06/19/2002

MICHALIK & WYLIE PLLC
14645 BEL-RED ROAD
SUITE 103
BELLEVUE, WA 98007

EXAMINER

NAJJAR, SALEH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/347,753

Applicant(s)

Lehew ET AL.

Examiner

Saleh Najjar

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on July 6, 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 12-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 and 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. This action is responsive to the application filed on July 6, 1999. Claims 1-27 are pending examination. Claims 1-27 represent program product and apparatus for automatic and transparent synchronization of server side state information with a client application.
2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract is longer 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
3. Claims 19 are objected to because of the following informalities: two claims having number 19 are presented. Appropriate correction is required.
4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 1-6, 8-9, 12-20, and 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reiche, U.S. Patent No. 6,092,196.

Reiche teaches the invention as claimed including a HTTP distributed remote authentication system (see abstract).

As to claim 1, Reiche teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions, comprising:

accessing a hidden web page via a request from a client application program (see fig. 1, col. 8-9, Reiche discloses that on a first access to the customer server 126, the client is transparently redirected to authentication server 110);

receiving information from the hidden web page (see col. 9, lines 35-55, Reiche discloses that the authentication server constructs a special URL personalized to the client according to the current transaction);

writing the information to a client storage (see col. 9, line 25-35, Reiche discloses that if the client was not logged in, a dialog is presented to him by the authentication server daemon which information is automatically stored in the client as cookie data regarding the logon transaction);

providing a server with data corresponding to the information received from the hidden web page written into the client storage (see col. 9, line 57 - col. 10, line 30, Reiche discloses that the specially constructed URL is sent to the server 126 which analyzes and verifies it); and

receiving state information from the server based on the data provided thereto (see col. 10, lines 25-55, Reiche discloses that the customer server 126 constructs a cookie of transaction log and sends it to the client browser application program).

As to claim 2, Reiche teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions of claim 1 wherein accessing a hidden web page includes invoking a browser from the client application (see col. 8-10).

As to claim 3, Reiche teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions of claim 1 wherein accessing a hidden web page includes passing data to the hidden web page (see col. 9, line 57 - col. 10, line 30, Reiche discloses that the specially constructed URL is sent to the server 126 which analyzes and verifies it).

As to claim 4, Reiche teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions of claim 3 wherein the data passed to the hidden web page includes time information indicative of a synchronization time with the server state information (see col. 9-10, Reiche discloses that a Row client ID is sent to the authentication server which is associated with time information concerning the transaction).

As to claim 5, Reiche teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions of claim 3 wherein receiving information from the hidden web page includes receiving at least some of the data passed thereto (see col. 8-10).

As to claim 6, Reiche teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions of claim 1 wherein receiving state information from the server

includes receiving data maintained at the server for synchronizing with data of the client browser (see col. 8-9).

As to claim 8, Reiche teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 6 having further computer-executable instructions for synchronizing the state information with data of the client application program (browser) (see col. 8-10, Reiche discloses that a transaction counter is updated by the server and tracked using the cookie data submitted from the client).

As to claim 9, Reiche teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 1 having further computer-executable instructions for linking the state information to data of the client application program (see col. 9-10, Reiche discloses that a row in a table is allocated at the authentication server memory database that links the number of transactions left and cookie expiry time with the user and the current transaction).

As to claim 12, Reiche teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions of claim 1 wherein receiving state information from the server includes receiving a cookie written into a client-side storage (see col. 10).

As to claim 13, Reiche teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions of claim 1 wherein providing a server with data includes providing the server with a time stamp of a synchronization time of server state information (see col. 9, lines 45-50; col. 10, lines 10-20, Reiche teaches that the client transparently sends a reference to an indicator allocated in a table memory containing expiry time data concerning the client session identifier).

As to claim 14, Reiche teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions of claim 1 wherein providing a server with data includes providing the server with a client identifier (see col. 9-10, Reiche discloses that a client identifier is passed to the authentication server and the customer server).

As to claim 15, Reiche teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 1 having further computer-executable instructions for providing authentication information to the server (see col., 9-10, Reiche teaches that authentication information is passed to the server 126).

As to claim 16, Reiche teaches a computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions, comprising:

providing a hidden web page (see fig. 1, col. 8-9, Reiche discloses that on a first access to the customer server 126, the client is transparently redirected to authentication server 110);

receiving a request from a client to access the hidden web page (see col. 9, lines 35-55, Reiche discloses that the authentication server constructs a special URL personalized to the client according to the current transaction); and

communicating information from the hidden web page to the client; and redirecting the client to another web page (see col. 9, lines 35-55, Reiche discloses that the authentication server constructs a special URL personalized to the client according to the current transaction which is used to redirect the client to the customer server 126).

As to claim 17, Reiche teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 16 having further computer-executable instructions for requesting awareness information at a server from the client, the awareness information corresponding to information communicated thereto from the hidden web page (see col. 9-10, Reiche discloses that cookie data is extracted from the client which contains transaction log information).

As to claim 18, Reiche teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 17 having further computer-executable instructions for determining whether the awareness information is received, and if so, providing state information to the client (see col. 9-10, Reiche discloses that the cookie information is extracted from the client and if not present, the client is redirected to a dialog window for authentication)..

As to claim 19, Reiche teaches the computer-readable medium having further computer-executable instructions of claim 16 wherein redirecting the client to another web page includes redirecting the client to a logon page (see col. 9-10, Reiche discloses that the client is redirected to a logon daemon).

As to claim 20, Reiche teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 16 having further computer-executable instructions for receiving authentication information from the client at the other web page (see col. 9-10, Reiche discloses that when authentication information is not present, the client is redirected to a logon page generated by the daemon process server).

As to claim 22, Reiche teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 16 having further computer-executable instructions for receiving data from the client corresponding to information communicated from the hidden web page to the client (see figs. 2a-2e; col. 9-10, Reiche discloses that URL information communicated to the client is communicated to the customer server).

As to claim 23, Reiche teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions of claim 22 wherein the data received from the client includes a

time stamp for synchronizing server state data therewith (see col. 10, Reiche discloses that cookie data includes a time stamp).

As to claim 24, Reiche teaches the computer-readable medium of claim 23 having further computer-executable instructions for communicating state data to the client based on the time stamp (see col. 10, Reiche discloses that data presented to the client is contingent on valid cookie data).

Claims 25-27 do not teach or define any new limitations over claims 1-5, 9, 12-20, and 22-24 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CAR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 7, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiche.

Reiche teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a HTTP distributed remote authentication system (see abstract).

As to claim 7, Reiche teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions of claim 6.

Reiche fails to teach the claimed limitation wherein the data maintained at the server is financial data.

However, "Official Notice" is taken that the concept and advantages servers presenting financial organization services is old and well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Reiche by specifying the customer server 126 as a financial organization services server.

As to claims 19, and 21, Reiche teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions of claim 18.

Reiche fails to teach the limitation wherein providing the state information includes, attaching the state information to a personalized web page generated at the server for the client.

However, "Official Notice" is taken that the concept and advantages of providing a personalized web page is old and well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Reiche by providing state information to a client through personalized WEB page. One would be motivated to do to personalize content accessed by the client.

8. Claims 10, and 11 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record fails to teach or define singly or in combination the claimed features of a state information represented as an image tag identifying a source of the state information or identifying an image tag identifying a registered media type.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Creating a personalized web page based on URL provided by client by Shane, U.S. Patent No. 5,793,972.
- Storing session state information at the client by Niblett et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,336,135.
- Secure graphical objects in web documents to present further information upon predefined condition by Nguyen, U.S. Patent No. 6,032,150.

- Monitoring and/or modifying web browsing sessions by Felciano et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,052,730.
- Transferring data for multiple applications through a single communication link by Wang et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,085,249.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saleh Najjar whose telephone number is (703) 308-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, AN MENG AI, can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-9052.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600. The fax number for the After-Final correspondence/amendment is (703) 746-7238. The fax number for official correspondence/amendment is (703) 746-7239. The fax number for Non-official draft correspondence/amendment is (703) 746-7240.



Saleh Najjar
Primary Examiner Art Unit 2154